

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1, 6-12, 15-21 and 23-32 are pending in the present application. By this reply, claims 2-5, 13, 14 and 22 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 12 and 21 are independent claims.

The claims have been revised to clarify the invention according to U.S. practice. These modifications are fully supported by the original disclosure and do not add any new matter.

**TITLE**

At the Examiner's request, a new title is provided herewith.

**35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

Claims 1, 9-12, 21, 25-27, and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al (USPN 6924594) in view of previously cited Lewandowski et al (US PG PUB 20050023972) (U.S. Patent No. 5,705,762). Claims 2 and 6 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al in view of previously cited Lewandowski et al in view of previously cited Hiraga et al (US PG PUB 20040195206). Claims 3, 7, 8 and 28 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al in view of Lewandowski et al in view of previously cited Yamazaki et al (US PG PUB 20050206313). Claims 4, 5, 13-20, 22-24, 29 and 30 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Ogura et al in view of Lewandowski et al in view of Hiraga et al in view of Yamazaki et al. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogura et al in view of Lewandowski et al in view of Park et al (US PG PUB 20020155320). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

Amended independent claims 1, 12 and 21 incorporate the subject matter of cancelled claims 5, 13 and 22 respectively, and provide further explanations on the materials for the antioxidant described, e.g., on page 13, paragraph 53 of the specification. The Examiner correctly acknowledges in the Office Action that the references are silent to the exact amount of organic material and metallic powder. Then, the Examiner relies on the decision in *In re Aller* to reject claims 5 and 13. Although the Examiner does not provide detailed explanation for the rejection of claim 22, claim 22 introduces the same or similar limitation as claims 5 and 13. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's assertions.

In Applicant's invention, the optimum ranges for the organic material and the metallic powder for the antioxidative material were carefully selected to serve the specific purpose of reducing "the difference in surface energy between the organic EL layer and the second electrode," thereby preventing the creation of an oxide film and enhancing an electrical property of the EL layer, as

explained on, e.g., page 13, paragraph 53 of the present specification. Hence, discovering these optimum ranges took Applicant more than “routine experimentation” that *In re Aller* mentions. Because these ranges that Applicant’s invention discovered and teaches are preferred for this specific purpose, there is no motivation to construct the device of the cited references with this specific composition for this specific purpose. Therefore, the ranges of Applicant’s invention support the patentability of the subject matter of independent claims 1, 12 and 21.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 12 and 21 clearly define the present invention over the references relied on by the Examiner. In addition, dependent claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from these independent claims, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from the independent claims, which are believed to be allowable.

Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner’s allegations made in rejecting the claims, Applicant hereby cancels existing claims 2-5, 13, 14 and 22 to expedite prosecution. Accordingly, the rejections are moot and must be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and

withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and to provide an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and further replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: August 31, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASH & BIRCH, LLP

By Esther H. Chong  
Esther H. Chong, #40,953

P.O. Box 747  
Falls Church, VA 22032-0747  
(703) 205-8000

EHC:sld